



IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT  
AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Applicant: Cali St.John                      Group Art Unit: 1733  
Serial No.: 09/637,242                      Examiner: Jessica L. Rossi  
Title: BUSINESS METHOD FOR INDICIA WITH SANITARY BEVERAGE CAN  
Filing Date: August 14, 2000  
Attorney Docket No.: 946-5

APPELLANT'S APPEAL BRIEF

Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

Appellant in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.192 and MPEP § 1206  
herewith submits this Appeal Brief concerning the foregoing  
application.

1. Real Party in Interest.

The real party in interest in this appeal is above identified  
Applicant.

2. Related Appeals and Interferences.

There are no other appeals or interferences.

3. Status of Claims.

All presently pending claims, namely claims 1-19, stand  
finally rejected based upon the cited prior art under 35 U.S.C. §  
103. The Board is respectfully requested to note that an Amendment  
Before Appeal was filed concurrently with this Appeal Brief to

address claim objections, 35 USC § 112 rejections, and a provisional double patenting rejection, such that all pending 19 claims are similarly situated as finally rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103. The claims being appealed are claims 1-19. The content of these claims are set forth in the Appendix to this Brief in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.192(c)(9).

4. Status of Amendments.

There were no amendments filed subsequent to the final rejection mailed on October 6, 2004 except for the one accompanying this Brief, which is expected to satisfy the Examiner's requirements with regard to claim objections, 35 U.S.C. § 112 rejections, and double patenting rejections.

5. Summary of Invention.

The present invention defined in the claims involved in the Appeal feature protective members for application to beverage containers so they will be clean for use in consuming the beverage directly from the container. (page 1, lines 18-25, page 12, lines 10-16) These protective members are manufactured by a protective member manufacturer who also conveys by profit making sale to third party advertisers a right to attach indicia including advertising to protective members which are adhered to beverage containers. (page 13, lines 7-8, page 1, lines 12-13. Four parties are involved, namely the protective member manufacturer, the third party advertisers, the beverage company and consumers. (page 13, lines 5-8). The invention is a method of doing business application concerning the protective member manufacturer. (page

13, lines 2-9)

6. Issues.

All the prior art rejections being appealed are based on 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness. In addition, all these rejections are based on combinations of more than one reference. The legal issues have to do with well established principles of patent law including the use of hindsight in combining references, the use of nonanalogous art as a citation in claiming obviousness, the combination of references where there is no suggestion in the art to combine, and the modification of a reference by the Examiner also known as citing a reference for more than what it teaches.

7. Grouping of Claims.

The claims groupings presented to the Board are:

- (a) claims 1, 4-5, 7-8, and 12
- (b) claims 3, 6, and 9-10
- (c) claims 11, 17, and 19

In regards to the first grouping, claim 5 will be argued to be separately patentable. The Board's attention is respectfully directed to claims 1, 3, 5 and 11.

8. Arguments.

The references relied upon by the Examiner in rejecting all nineteen (19) pending claims are as follows: Kinoian, et al., U.S. Patent No. 3,690,509, Bozlee, U.S. Patent No. 6,354,645, an English translation of Kagami in Japanese reference JP 6-171650, Burns, U.S. Patent No. 6,127,437, Ruemer, U.S. Patent No. 4,402,421, Takayama, U.S. Patent No. 6,015,059, Dronzek, U.S. Patent No.

5,925,208, Sommers, U.S. Patent No. 6,620,281 and Miyazaki, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,863,624.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-2, 4-5 and 12 on the combination of the references Kinoian, et al. and Bozlee. The rejection is improper for at least three (3) legal reasons described above in the issues portion of this Brief. To reiterate, those three (3) reasons are the use of hindsight in combining references, the use of nonanalogous art as a citation in claiming obviousness, and the combination of references where there is no suggestion in the art to combine.

The first one is that it is only possible to make the combination of these two references through the use of hindsight. The notion that one can not use hindsight in combining references is quite old in patent law. *Loam Co. v. Higgins*, 105 U.S. 580 (1882). Hindsight is now well established to be impermissible to piece together references for obviousness rejections. *In re Warner and Warner*, 154 U.S.P.Q. 173, 178 (C.C.P.A. 1967), cert. denied, 389 U.S. 1057 (1968); *Ex parte Haymond*, 41 U.S.P.Q.2d 1217, 1219-1220 (Bd. App. 1996); MPEP 2143.01, *Ex parte Levengood*, 28 U.S.P.Q.2d 1300 (Bd. App. 1993); *In re Kotzab*, 217 F.3d 1365, 1371, 55 U.S.P.Q.2d 1313, 1318, (Fed. Cir. 2000). The reason that it constitutes hindsight is because the reference Bozlee is nonanalogous art, since it teaches carrying bags with handles which can include advertising. The present invention deals with protective members applied to beverage containers such as cans. There is no reason to look to the bag handle art.

Put another way, there must be a suggestion in the art to combine references. *Uniroyal v. Rudkin-Wiley Corp.*, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1434, 1439 (Fed. Cir. 1988); *Ex parte Dussaud*, 7 U.S.P.Q.2d 1818, 1820 (Bd. App. 1988). The mere fact that references can be combined is insufficient. MPEP 2143.01; *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 U.S.P.Q.2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990); *Litton Systems, Inc. v. Honeywell, Inc.*, 39 U.S.P.Q.2d 1321, 1327 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *SmithKline Diagnostics, Inc. v. Helena Labs Corp.*, 8 U.S.P.Q.2d 1468, 1475 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

Rejections of claims 1-2, 4-5 and 12 based on Kinoian, et al. and Bozlee is also improper because neither reference teaches a substantially wrinkle free skin tight seal between the protective member and at least a portion of the mouth contact area of the container. The Examiner points to column 3, lines 10-25 and column 4, lines 24-25 of Kinoian, et al., but examination thereof shows no reference whatsoever to a substantially wrinkle free skin tight seal between the protective member and the container. The wrinkle free skin tight seal is an important feature of the present invention recited in claim 1 because it is necessary to prevent contamination from getting under any portion of the protective member where it can come in contact with the container surface.

It is well established that a reference only stands for what it actually discloses. *In re Gordon, et al.*, 221 U.S.P.Q. 1125, 1127 (Fed. Cir. 1984); *Carl Schenck, A.G. v. Nortron Corp.*, 218 U.S.P.Q.2d 698, 702 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Imperato*, 179 U.S.P.Q. 730, 732 (C.C.P.A. 1973). Put another way, modification of a

reference unwarranted by the disclosure thereof is improper. *Carl Schenck, A.G. v. Nortron Corp., supra.*

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 6, 9-10, and 16 based on the combination of the references Kinoian, et al., Bozlee and Kagami. Claim 3 and claim 16 include the limitation of manufacturing the protective member in an hourglass configuration. Bozlee is nonanalogous art, Kinoian, et al. is conceded by the Examiner to be silent on an hourglass configuration, and then Examiner asserts that Kagami teaches an hourglass configuration for the protective member. But examination of Kagami reveals that it is silent on an hourglass configuration to facilitate adherence to a top and convex side of a container without deformation, without heat shrink application, and without wrinkling of a material protective member. Modification unwarranted by the disclosure in a reference is improper as set forth previously herein. *Carl Schenck, A.G. v. Nortron Corp., supra.* A reference only stands for what it actually discloses. *In re Gordon, et al., supra; In re Imperato, supra.*

Finally, the Board's attention is respectfully directed to claims 5 and 11. Claim 11 includes the limitations that the protective member facilitates using the method for such things as games of chance, premiums, collectibles, redeemables, merchandise acquisition means, and prizes without a user knowing in advance of the protective member removal which of a plurality of chances the user has obtained. The Examiner has rejected claim 11 on the combination of the references to Kinoian, et al., Bozlee, Kagami

and Ruemer. The Examiner further concedes Kinoian, et al. is silent as to the foregoing limitations and points to Ruemer, column 2, lines 23-25 and 49-51. In fact, Ruemer discloses only redeemable prizes. No reference discloses games of chance, premiums, collectibles, and redeemables.

In claim 5 indicia on the protective member includes the purposes of advertising, promotion, games of chance, premiums, collectibles, redeemables, merchandise acquisition means, prizes, public service announcements, instructional information, and warnings. Claim 5 is rejected by the Examiner using the references Kinoian, et al., and Bozlee on same basis as described for claim 1. However the Examiner also points out that Kinoian, et al. teaches that the indicia can be advertising or instructions referencing column 3, lines 29 and 30. That is true. But that means there is no reference teaching games of chance, public service announcements, and warnings. Once again a reference only stands for what it actually discloses. *In re Gordon, et al., supra; Carl Schenck, A.G. v. Nortron Corp., supra; In re Imperato, supra.* Modification unwarranted by the disclosure of references is improper. *In re Randol and Redford*, 165 U.S.P.Q. 586 (C.C.P.A. 1970); *National Tractor Pullers Assn., Inc. v. Watkins*, 205 U.S.P.Q. 892, 911; *In re Irani and Moedritzer*, 166 U.S.P.Q. 24. (C.C.P.A. 1970).

#### CONCLUSION

The present invention is not only a method of doing business application, it also recognizes the formation of a new business

entity referred to as the protective member manufacturer. The beverage container protective member prior art is shown in the references cited by the Examiner to include only three (3) entities, namely, the beverage company, third party advertisers, and the consumer. The Examiner has not located in the five years that this application has been pending any reference in the beverage container protective member art which teaches the establishment of a new business that combines protective sanitized beverage cans from contamination and third party paid advertising with a new business entity that ties together both features into a money making enterprise in the form of a new business. That is why the Examiner has cited Bozlee, but Bozlee is not in the beverage container protective member art. There is no suggestion that one skilled in the art should look to the bag handle art to find the creation of a new entity. It takes the existence of a new entity to drive the business of combining these features into a profit making enterprise. Bozlee is a bag handle patent that happens to have advertising but it has only one line in the patent that speaks to the notion of making money from the advertisers and it is simply nonanalogous art. Under the circumstances, claim 1 should certainly be allowable. Reversal of the Examiner is respectfully requested.

9. Appendix.

What is claimed is:

1. A business method for a protective member manufacturer relating to beverage containers comprising:



the protective member manufacturer conveying by profit making sale to third party advertisers a right to attach indicia to consumer removed, flexible protective members to be adhered to beverage containers;

manufacturing the protective members;

applying indicia to the protective members; and

adhering the protective members to the containers to form a substantially wrinkle free skin tight seal between the protective member and at least a portion of a mouth contact area of the beverage containers.

2. The method of claim 1 in which third party advertisers are not a beverage company.

3. The method of claim 1 which further comprises:

manufacturing the protective members in an hourglass configuration to facilitate adherence to a top and convex side of a container without deformation and without wrinkling of a material of the protective member by folding it over a rim of the beverage container such that when adherence occurs there is facilitated the substantially wrinkle free skin tight seal between the protective member and at least a portion of a mouth contact area of the beverage container.

4. The method of claim 1 which further comprises sanitizing at least the mouth contact portion of the containers.

5. The method of claim 1 in which the indicia is at least one of advertising, promotion, games of chance, premiums, collectibles, redeemables, merchandise acquisition means, prizes, public service announcements, instructional information, and warnings.

6. The method of claim 1 wherein indicia is applied to the protective members by printing.

7. The method of claim 6 which further comprises treatment of the protective members to accept and retain printing ink.

8. The method of claim 7 in which the treatment of the protective members is by corona discharge.

9. The method of claim 6 wherein the printing is applied to an underside of the protective members.

10. The method of claim 9 where the protective member is opaque so that the user cannot see the indicia until the protective member is removed.

11. The method of claim 10 where the underside printing and opaque protective member facilitates using the method for such things as games of chance, premiums, collectibles, redeemables, merchandise acquisition means, and prizes without a user knowing in

advance of protective member removal which of a plurality of chances the user has obtained.

12. The method of claim 1 wherein the protective members are adhered to containers using adhesive.

13. The method of claim 12 in which the adhesive is antibacterial.

14. The method of claim 1 which further comprises imposing an anti-static chemical treatment on the protective member such that each one of the protective members will slide easily from an adjoining member and not cling to it under high speed dispensing.

15. The method of claim 1 which further comprises imposing chemical treatment on the protective member such that adhesive will bond more strongly to the member and less strongly to metal of the beverage container such that no adhesive residue is left on the container after removal of the protective member thus allowing the protective member to be adhered to other surfaces.

16. A business method for a protective member manufacturer relating to beverage containers comprising:

the protective member manufacturer conveying to a third party advertiser by profit making sale a right to attach indicia to consumer removed, flexible protective members to be

adhered to a beverage container;

manufacturing each protective member in an hourglass configuration to facilitate adherence to a top and convex side of a container without deformation and without wrinkling of a material of each protective member;

applying indicia to each protective member; and

adhering each protective member to a container including by folding each over a rim of a beverage container to form a substantially wrinkle free skin tight seal between the protective member and at least a portion of a mouth contact area of the beverage containers.

17. A business method for a protective member manufacturer relating to beverage containers comprising:

the protective member manufacturer conveying by profit making sale to a third party advertiser, a right to attach indicia to consumer removed, flexible protective members to be adhered to beverage containers;

manufacturing the protective members;

applying indicia to opaque protective members by printing on the underside thereof to facilitate using the method for such things as games of chance, premiums, collectibles, redeemables, merchandise acquisition means, and prizes without a user knowing in advance of protective member removal which of a plurality of chances the user has obtained; and

adhering the protective members to the containers to form

a substantially wrinkle free skin tight seal between the protective member and at least a portion of a mouth contact area of the beverage containers.

18. The method of claim 1, wherein the protective members when at least partially removed from the beverage containers are reattachable thereto.

19. The method of claim 1, wherein the protective members are collectible.



CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I HEREBY CERTIFY that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail on this 19th day of September, 2005, addressed to Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Respectfully submitted,

ROBERT J. VAN DER WALL, P.A.  
Gables One Tower  
1320 South Dixie Highway  
Suite 1275  
Coral Gables, FL 33146  
Telephone: (305) 358-6000  
Facsimile: (305) 661-6477

By

ROBERT J. VAN DER WALL  
Attorney for Applicant  
Registration No. 28,125

RJV\jac

D:\...\STJOHN\APPEAL-B.005